

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Regular First Appeal No. 170 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.07.2022

Reserved On: 07.05.2022

Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation
Limited

... Appellant(s)

Versus

Mal Mohammad (Deceased) through his legal heirs and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Ashwani Kumar Chopra, Senior Advocates
with Mr. Pritam Singh Saini and Mr. Vidul Kapoor,
Advocates, for the HSIIDC.

Mr. Shailendra Jain, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Satyendra Chauhan and Mr. Jagtar Singh, Advocates.

Mr. Karan Nehra, Ms Sandeep Kaur, Mr. Abhay Josan,
Mr. Harvinder Thakur, Mr. Sushil K. Sharma,
Mr. M.L.Sharma, Mr. Varun Gupta, Mr. J.S.Yadav,
Mr. Gulshan Nandwani, Mr. Himanshu Sharma and
Mr. Amit Jain, Advocates, for the landowners.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, Assistant Advocate General,
and Ms. Vibha Tewari, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. Introduction and Background

1.1 This batch of appeals has been filed by the Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited (hereinafter referred to as “the HSIIDC”) as well as the landowners, while questioning the correctness of the judgment dated 14.02.2020, passed by the Reference

Court (hereinafter referred to as “the RC”). The notification under Section 4 and 6 of the 1894 Act and the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as “the LAC”) as also the RC are common. Hence, the learned counsel representing the parties are *ad idem* that this batch of appeals can be conveniently disposed of by a common judgment.

1.2 The relevant particulars, for the purpose of decision of the present case, are as under:-

S.NO.	TITLE	DETAILS
1.	Date of Notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act.	29.09.2005
2.	Date of Notification under Section 6 of the 1894 Act.	15.12.2005
3.	Purpose of Acquisition.	For construction of Express Highway connecting NH-1, 10, 8 and 2.
4.	Location, area and nature of the acquired land	Proposing to acquire the land measuring 639 kanals and 17 marlas of land located in village Sehsola , Tehsil Tauru, District Mewat.
5.	Number and Date of the Award of the Land Acquisition Collector.	No.9 dated 26.05.2006 acquiring the lands comprised in Rectangle No. 103, 104, 115, 116,117,118, 119, 125 and 126.
6.	Amount assessed by the Land Acquisition Collector.	₹12,50,000/- per acre.
7.	Amount determined by the Reference Court.	The RC, on 21.11.2009, in the first round, dismissed the applications under Section 18 of the 1894 Act. However, the High Court on 31.01.2019, in <i>Om Parkash v. State of Haryana and Others (Regular First Appeal No. 3552 of 2010)</i> , remitted back the matter to the RC for fresh decision.
8.	Date of re-decision of the RC and the amount re-assessed, after remand.	Vide judgment dated 14.02.2020, the RC has assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹17,50,000/- per acre while directing that the landowners

S.NO.	TITLE	DETAILS
		shall also be entitled to 50% of the market value of the land assessed as compensation for severance of the land if the unacquired remnant land is less than 1 acre.

1.3 For the purpose of describing the potential and the market value of the acquired land, the pleadings of both the parties are common in all the cases, therefore, the pleadings as noticed in the cases arising from village Dingerheri, are extracted as under:-

“On the applications filed under Section 18 of the 1894 Act, the LAC has referred the matter to the RC for assessment of the market value of the acquired land. It was claimed that the market value of the acquired land is approximately ₹1,00,00,000/- per acre and the LAC did not take into consideration the location, nature and the vicinity of the land in question to other landmark places. It is claimed that the National Highway No.8 and 10 are at a distance of only 6 Kms. The Industrial Model Town, Manesar (hereinafter referred to as “the IMT”) is 10 kms. away from the village. The Gurugram city is only 20 kms. away from the village. Several industries, residential sectors, commercial institutions, farm houses and poultry farms surround the village. It is also claimed that there is a pucca road leading to the land in question and the LAC has failed to take notice of the fact that the acquired land is located near Tauru city and there existed tube-wells, rooms, barbed wire fencing, underground water pipe lines, valuable trees etc.

The LAC also failed to take into consideration that the State Government has already acquired the land in the revenue estates of villages Manesar, Kasan etc. and these areas are located near the acquired land. The landowners also claim that the townships, namely Pataudi, Sohna, Tauru, Nuh, Bhiwari, Manesar and Gurugram city are within a distance around 5 to 30 kms. from the acquired land and the land has great potential for residential and commercial development. There exist several petrol pumps, markets, resorts, golf courses, factories, farm houses and commercial and educational institutions in Manesar, Pachgaon, Pataudi, Tauru, Bhiwari, Sohna, Nuh, Gurugram and Palwal”

1.4 The HSIIDC has also taken the same stand as in the pleadings in the case of village Dingerheri, which are extracted as under:-

“Per contra, the HSIIDC took a stand that the LAC has already awarded excessive compensation, therefore, there is no scope for re-determination. It is stated that the IMT, Manesar is at a significant distance. Moreover, the acquired land is not chahi (not giving two crops in a year) land in nature.”

1.5 The RC, on appreciation of the pleadings, has culled out the following issues:-

- “1) What was the market value of the acquired land on the date of notification under Section 4 L.A.Act? OPP.*
- 2) Whether the petitions are time barred? OPR.*
- 3) Relief”.*

1.6 In the considered view of this Court, the following points need determination:-

- i) What was the appropriate market value of the acquired land on the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act i.e. 29.09.2005?
- ii) Is it appropriate to rely upon the assessment made by the RC with respect to the acquisition of a different parcel of land by a separate notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, which was issued after a period of more than two years of the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act in the present case, more particularly when neither the copy of the judgment passed by the Court while deciding the cases arising from the separate notification is made a part of the record nor there is evidence to prove the comparative location of respective parcels of the acquired land through these notifications?
- iii) What should be the compensation for severance in case the land remaining with the owner stands bifurcated in more than two or more parcels due to the acquisition of the land for the construction of a highway?

2. **Evidence Produced by the Parties**

2.1 In oral evidence, the landowners, in order to prove their case, have examined the following witnesses:

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the Witness
1.	PW.1 Haider Ali	Petitioner

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the Witness
2.	PW.2 Jaikam Khan	Registration Clerk
3.	PW.3 Haseen Ahmed	Draftsman
4.	PW.4 Pardeep Kumar	Patwari

2.2 In documentary evidence, the landowners have also produced the following documents:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the document
1.	Exh.P1	Jamabandi of year 2014-15
2.	Exh.P2	Mutation No.7336 dated 27.6.2016
3.	Exh.P3	Aks Sizra of village Sehsola
4.	Exh.P9	Site plan of village Sehsola
5.	Exh.P10	Aks Sizra

2.3 On the other hand, the HSIIDC, in oral evidence, has examined the following witness:

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the Witness
1.	RW.1 Mukesh Kumar	Patwari.

2.4 The HSIIDC has also produced the following documents in its documentary evidence:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the document
1.	Exh.R1	Sale deed No.1183 dated 7.10.2004
2.	Exh.R2	Sale deed No.1652 dated 1.2.2005
3.	Exh.R3	Sale deed No.599 dated 17.6.2005
4.	Exh.R4	Sale deed No.980 dated 12.8.2005
5.	Exh.R5	Sale deed No.2123 dated 10.1.2006
6.	Exh.R6	Sale deed No.2155 dated 13.1.2006
7.	Exh.R7	Sale deed No.540 dated 13.6.2005
8.	Exh.R8	Sale deed No.1108 dated 10.9.2007
9.	Exh.R9	Sale deed No.1320 dated 16.6.2006
10.	Exh.R10	Sale deed No.1184 dated 7.10.2004
11.	Exh.R11	Sale deed No.1834 dated 11.3.2005

3. The RC has compiled a tabulated information of the various sale exemplars produced by both the parties, which is extracted as under:-

Regular First Appeal No. 170 of 2021 (O&M)
And Other Connected Appeals

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Vasika No.	Dated	Sale Consideration (In Rs.)	Land Sold (K M S)	Rate per acre	Village
1.	P4	1483	26.10.1999	32,000	0K 4M	12,80,000	Rupaheri
2.	P5	447	3.6.2001	53,000	0K 5M	16,96,000	Rupaheri
3.	P6	780	24.05.2007	3,25,000	0K 13M	40,00,000	Rewasan
4.	P7	713	23.06.2003	2,30,000	0K 10M	36,80,000	Rewasan
5.	P8	3427	24.11.2005	50,00,000	1000 sq yards	2,42,00,000	Rojka Meo
6.	R1	1183	7.10.2004	4,60,000	21K 0M	1,75,238	Sehsola
7.	R2	1652	1.2.2005	34,50,000	137K 9M	2,00,800	Sehsola
8.	R3	599	16.6.2005	3,90,000	15K 11M	2,00,643	Sehsola
9.	R4	980	2.8.2005	6,95,000	34K 14M	1,60,230	Sehsola
10.	R5	2123	10.1.2006	4,50,000	6K 7M	5,66,929	Tauru
11.	R6	2155	12.1.2006	1,83,000	5K 5M	2,78,857	Padheni
12.	R7	540	13.6.2005	15,00,000	39K 10M	3,03,797	Padheni
13.	R8	1108	10.9.2007	1,50,000	0K 16.5M	14,54,545	Kharkhari
14.	R9	1320	16.6.2006	1,41,000	2K 5M	5,01,333	Bahadri
15.	R10	1184	7.10.2004	4,82,000	22K 0M	1,75,272	Sehsola
16.	R11	1834	11.3.2005	2,25,000	8K 0M	2,25,000	Sehsola

Note: The correctness of the above extracted tabulated compilation of the sale deeds by the RC, has not been disputed by the learned counsel representing the parties.

4. The RC has held that the sale instances (Ex.R1 to Ex.R11) produced by the HSIIDC being below the amount assessed by the LAC cannot be taken into account while assessing the market value of the acquired land. The RC also observed that the various sale deeds produced by the landowners can also not be relied upon as none of them is with respect to the parcel of land located in village Sehsola. The RC noticed that village Rojka Meo is 9 kms. whereas, village Rewasan is 13 kms. and village Rupaheri is 8 kms. away from the acquired land.

Thereafter, the RC proceeded to rely upon its own award passed

on 12.09.2012 in the *LA case No.21 of 2009/2011 titled as Jitender etc. Vs. State of Haryana etc.* while assessing the compensation for the land in village Dhulawat as on 11.12.2007 (the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act).

6. The RC also held that the landowners shall also be entitled to compensation on account of severance if the remnant land available with the landowners is less than an acre.

7. Heard the learned counsel representing the parties, at length and with their able assistance, perused the judgments passed by the RC as well as the record of the RC, which was requisitioned.

8. The learned counsel representing the HSIIDC contends that the RC has erred in refusing to take into consideration the sale exemplars produced by the HSIIDC. He contends that the RC has wrongly relied upon the judgment dated 12.09.2012 in the *Jitender's case (supra)*. He submits that neither the aforesaid judgment is a part of the record nor it has been proved that the acquired land in the aforesaid case, is comparable with the acquired land of village Sehola. He further contends that in the *Jitender's (supra)*, the assessment of market value of the acquired land is as existing on 11.12.2007, whereas in the present case, the assessment is required to be made as on 29.09.2005. While referring to the findings of the RC in para 41 of its judgment, he contends that the compensation for severance of the land has been awarded without there being any evidence to that effect.

9. Per contra, the learned counsels representing the landowners, while drawing the attention of this Court to the sale deeds, submit that the Court has wrongly ignored the sale deeds of villages Rewasan as the entire

area falls in Tehsil Tauru and there is no evidence to prove that the market value of the land in both the villages is different.

10. Discussion by the Court

Issue No.(i)

10.1 Let us first analyze the reasons recorded by the RC. The first reason given by the RC, while refusing to take into consideration the sale deeds (Ex.R1 to Ex.R11), is based upon the wrong interpretation of Section 25 of the 1894 Act. On a careful reading of Section 25 of the 1894 Act, it is evident that the RC is only debarred from awarding the amount lower than the amount assessed by the LAC. However, there is no bar in taking into account the various sale deeds produced by the parties which reflect the price lesser than the amount assessed by the LAC. This matter is no longer *res integra* in view of the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in ***Lal Chand vs. Union of India (2009) 15 SCC 769***. As regards the various sale deeds produced by the landowners, the RC has correctly observed that these sale deeds cannot be relied upon as the land of villages Rojka Meo, Rewasan and Rupaheri are at a distance from the acquired land and there is no evidence to prove that the land, in the aforesaid villages, is comparable with the acquired land of village Sehsola. It is noted here that village Rojka Meo and Rewasan are on Delhi-Ajmer National Highway.

10.2 The next reason assigned by the RC while assessing the market value is, also, erroneous. In the absence of evidence to prove that the assessment made on 12.09.2012 in the ***Jitender's case (supra)*** is applicable to the present case, the RC has wrongly relied upon the same. There is no evidence to prove the comparative location of the land in village Dhulawat

with the acquired land in village Sehsola. Furthermore, the relevant date of assessment in the aforesaid judgment is 11.12.2007, whereas, in these cases, the assessment is required to be made as on 29.09.2005.

10.3 On a careful perusal of the tabulated compilation of the sale deeds, reproduced in para 3 of this judgment, it is evident that the landowners have not produced any sale deed of parcel of land located in village Sehsola. On the other hand, the HSIIDC has produced as many as six sale instances of various parcels of land in the same village. It is evident that the price reflected in the aforesaid sale deeds is ranging between ₹1,50,000/- to ₹2,25,000/- per acre. The LAC has already offered to pay ₹12,50,000/- per acre. Resultantly, there is no evidence to prove that the amount offered by the LAC was not reflecting the true market value as on 29.09.2005.

10.4 Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, this Court comes to a conclusion that the RC has erred in enhancing the market value of the acquired land from ₹12,50,000/- to ₹ 17,50,000/-. Therefore, the appropriate market value of the acquired land on the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act i.e. 29.09.2005 is ₹12,50,000/- as assessed by the LAC, which requires no interference. Hence, the issue No.(i) stands answered.

Issue No.(ii)

10.5 Now, let us examine issue No.(ii). This issue has elaborately been discussed in the case of village Dingerheri in Regular First Appeal No. 11 of 2021, which is extracted as under:-

“9.9 It is well settled that before the Court relies upon some documentary evidence so as to assess the market value, the Court is required to see as to whether such document is part of

the file or not. The Court is also required to see as to whether the land sold through the sale deed is comparable with the acquired land or not. In the absence of such finding, it is not safe to rely upon the same. As already noticed, the landowners have failed to produce any sale instance of the acquired land located in village Dingerheri.

9.10 As per the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (hereinafter referred to as “the 1872 Act”), the judgments of the Courts are relevant only in accordance with Section 40, 41, 42 and 43 of the 1872 Act. Section 40 of the 1872 Act provides that a previous judgment which operates as bar to a second suit or trial is relevant. Section 41 of the 1872 Act provides that the judgments, orders or decrees of a competent Court, in the exercise of probate, matrimonial, admiralty or insolvency jurisdiction, which confers upon or takes away from any person any legal character, or which declares any person to be entitled to any such character, or to be entitled to any specific thing, are relevant when the existence of any such legal character, or the title of any such person to any such thing, is relevant. Section 42 of the 1872 Act is in the nature of a residuary provision, which provides that the judgments, which are not relevant under Section 41, but they relate to the matters of public nature which are relevant to the inquiry, shall be relevant, but shall not be a conclusive proof of the fact which they state. Section 43 of the 1872 Act provides that all other judgments, except

those mentioned in Section 40 to 42 of the 1872 Act shall be irrelevant unless the existence of such judgment is a fact in issue or is relevant under some other provision of the 1872 Act. If we analyze the judgment passed by the RC on 12.09.2012, it is obvious that a previous judgment is not relevant and does not fall within the scope of Section 40, 41, 42 or 43 of the 1872 Act. Furthermore, as per the observations made by the RC, the aforesaid judgment is with respect to notification issued on 11.12.2007, which is more than 2 years after the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued vide notification dated 29.09.2005. The aforesaid assessment made by the Court shall not be relevant for assessing the market value of the acquired land on 29.09.2005. Moreover, there is no evidence to prove that the acquired land of village Dhulawat was comparable with the acquired land in the present case. Thus, the second issue is answered in negative.

10.6 For the reasons recorded above, the issue No. (ii) stands substantially answered.

Issue No.(iii)

10.7 As regards the compensation for severance charges, the matter, in detail, has been discussed in the cases arising from village Dingerheri in ***Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited v. Suraj Mal and Others (Regular First Appeal No. 11 of 2021, decided on 07.07.2022)*** the relevant discussion is extracted as under:-

“9.11 The third issue which arises for consideration has already been noticed above. A narrow strip of land has been

*acquired for constructing an express highway. The landowners have claimed damages for severance/bifurcation of their land into two or more parcels. It has been projected that due to acquisition of the narrow strip of land, the remaining land of certain landowners is located on both the sides of expressway. The RC, after relying upon the judgments passed in **State of Haryana v. Rajinder Kumar 2000 (1) LACC 360** and **Smt.Bindu Garg v. State of Haryana 1999 (2) RCR (Civil) 261** has assessed the damages on account of severance @ 50%. It would be noted here that there is no clarity as to whether such amount @ 50% is with respect to the acquired land or unacquired land. Moreover, the Court has not analyzed the evidence to prove the damages, if any, suffered by the landowners. The RC has committed an error in blindly following the judgment passed by the Court without analyzing its facts. In **Rajinder Kumar's case** (supra), the land was acquired for construction of a railway over-bridge. The market value of the acquired land located adjacent to the railway over-bridge was substantially reduced due to difficulty in accessing the unacquired remnant land. In that context, the Court awarded 50% compensation for the remaining unacquired land. Similarly, in **Smt.Bindu Garg's case** (supra), the Court found that the remaining unacquired land has been rendered completely inaccessible and has resulted in complete loss. In that context, the Court awarded 50% of the market*

*value on account of damages suffered due to severance of the unacquired land. In the present case, no evidence to assess the quantum of damages, on account of severance, has been led. The judgments relied upon by the RC were not applicable. However, this Court cannot overlook that the landowners must have suffered some amount of damages or loss on account of severance or the bifurcation of the unacquired land into two or more parcels. With respect to similar acquisition of land for the same expressway i.e. Kundali-Maneser-Palwal Expressway, this Court, in **HSI IDC vs. Rattan Singh and Others (RFA-5620-2013, decided on 05.10.2021)**, held as under:-*

“The next issue which requires adjudication is regarding the proper and appropriate compensation/damages for the severance of the land in two parts. Clause (3) of Section 23 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, enables the Court to order the payment of the damage sustained by the person on account of severance from other land. In the present case, the acquisition of the aforementioned land is for the construction of the express highway. A long strip of land has been acquired. In the cases arising from village Mehndipur, the official of the HSI IDC has himself admitted that the land of various owners stands divided in two independent unconnected parcels due to the compulsory acquisition of the land. Although, the land

owners have failed to lead any evidence to prove the extent of loss/damage suffered by them, even in that case, it is clear cut/indisputable that the owners would have difficulty in accessing the parcels of separate land across the road. Some of the land owners may have been left with only a small portion on one side of the road, whereas remaining part is on the other side of the road. In any case, it would become uneconomical and hard to cultivate and irrigate a small piece of land which is left on the one side of the Road. It may be noted here that in the appeals arising from the reference applications of the acquisition of the land located at village Daboda Khurd, the reference court has assessed the damages for severance of the land to the extent of 20% with regard to market value of the acquired or unacquired land whichever is less. The State or the HSIIDC have not filed any appeals. In other words, they have accepted the judgments. The HSIIDC has filed appeals in the cases arising from the acquisition made at village Mehndipur, where surprisingly the same Presiding Judge has ordered the 50% of the market value of the acquired land towards the severance charges. In this case, Chand Singh appeared as PW1 on behalf of the land owners. He did not depose about the loss suffered by the owners on account of severance of the unacquired land. However,

when Bhagwan Singh Rana deposed on behalf of HSIIDC, he admitted that Smt. Bala, Balraj, Dharam Singh, Kapoor Singh, Dilbagh Singh, Ram Singh, Priti Singh and Munshi etc. have suffered loss on account of the fact that their unacquired/remaining land stands sundered due to the construction of the road (Expressway). In other words, these owners are now left with unacquired land which is in two separate independent parcels. They will be required to make special arrangements for irrigation and cultivation of land in the both the parcels of land situated on both the sides of the road which will be a hardship to them. Hence, the Court cannot deprive the owners from damages on account of the severance, merely because the owners have failed to lead any evidence to prove the extent of loss/damages suffered by them. However, there is no evidence to prove that the owners have suffered damages to the extent of 50% of the market value of the acquired land. Furthermore, there is no appeal by the State and the HSIIDC in the appeals arising from the acquisition made at village Daboda Khurd.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the appeals filed by the HSIIDC are allowed to the extent that the owners of villages Mehendipur shall also be entitled to the damages for severance of the land to the extent of

20% of the market value of the acquired or unacquired land whichever is less. However, the Executing Court is directed to ascertain as to whether the land of a particular owner stood bisected or not, before ordering the payment of damages for the severance of the land.

*The learned counsel representing the owners have relied upon the judgments passed in **Narender Kaur and Gurbachan Singh (supra)**. In both the judgments, the Court after coming to a conclusion that some part of the acquired land is virtually lost as it is rendered inaccessible and uneconomical, assessed the severance charges at @ 50%. As already noticed in this case, no such evidence has been led by the landowners to prove that fact. In these cases, it has come on record that the unacquired land of certain owners stands separated/bisected into two different parcels due to construction of the road”.*

9.12 *Following the aforesaid view, the landowners shall also be entitled to damages for severance on the same lines. Thus, the third issue is also substantially answered.*

9.13 *Further, this Court affirm the observation of the RC that damages for severance or the compensation on account of severance shall only be granted in regard to the land comprised in khasra numbers, which have been severed on account of acquisition and the remnant land is less than an*

acre.”

10.8 For the reasons recorded above, the issue No. (iii) stands substantially answered.

11. Decision

11.1 Consequently, the judgment passed by the RC is set aside, whereas, the assessment made by the LAC with regard to the market value of the acquired land is maintained. However, the landowners shall be entitled to the compensation for severance as discussed above. With these modifications, the appeals are disposed of.

11.2 The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, in all the appeals, shall stand disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

July 08, 2022
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party’s Name
1.	RFA No.171 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM Versus Qutubuddin and others
2.	RFA No.2521 of 2021	Iliyas and others Versus State of Haryana and others
3.	RFA No.2360 of 2021	Gian Chand through his LRs Versus State of Haryana and others
4.	RFA No.179 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Aftab Ahmed and others
5.	RFA No.178 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure

		Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Gain Chand deceased through LRs and others
6.	RFA No.176 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Iliyas and others
7.	RFA No.175 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hamida and others
8.	RFA No.174 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Fateh Mohammad and others
9.	RFA No.173 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Subeddin and others
10.	RFA No.172 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hamida and others
11.	RFA No.177 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Nabbu and others

July 08, 2022
“DK”

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge